## **REMARKS**

Claims 7-35 and 41-60 are now pending in the application. Claims 4-6, and 38-40 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicant would like to thank Patent Examiner Lemma for this time and courtesy extended during a telephonic interview conducted on July 28, 2006 in which the multiple dependent claims issue was discussed.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 4.

Claims 4-35 and 38-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

By this amendment, claims 4-6 and 38-40 have been cancelled. Claims 7-35 and 41-60 have been amended to include all of the limitations of the now cancelled base claim. As such, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph should also be moot.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4-6 and 36-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schlossberg et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0066034).

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER** 

The Examiner states that claims 7-35 and 41-60 would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have essentially amended the claims to

include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, all claims

currently pending should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

August 9, 2006

Rv

Robert M. Siminski Reg. No. 36,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. Box 828

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

(248) 641-1600

RMS/jao

Serial No. 10/084,238

Page 35 of 35